



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,569	01/29/2002	Migaku Kobayashi	N230500C1	8651

7590

01/13/2003

Darryl G. Walker
WALKER & SAKO, LLP
Suite 235
300 South First Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

GOUDREAU, GEORGE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10-069569

Applicant(s)

Kobayashi

Examiner

George Goudreau

Group Art Unit

1763

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on (7-021 to 10-021) (ie, -papers #5-8)

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 21-48 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 21-35, 41-48 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 36, 38-40 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 37 is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received

in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5

☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☒ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1763

15. Claims 21-35, and 41-48 are allowed.

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 36, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barth et. al. as applied in paragraph 16 of the previous office action further in view of Oda (5,793,113).

Barth et. al. as applied in paragraph 16 of the previous office action fail to disclose the following aspects of applicant's claimed invention:

-the specific etching of the W layer selectively to the TiN/Ti layers in the process taught above such that the top surface of the W plug is recessed relative to the TiN layer on the surface of the ILD

Oda teaches that it is desirable to selectively etch back or recess a W layer to underlying layers of TiN/Ti when forming an interconnect in order to improve the quality of the bond formed between adjacent layers. This is discussed specifically in the abstract; and discussed in general in columns 1-40. This is shown in figures 1-18.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to selectively etch back or recess the surface of the W layer to the underlying TiN/Ti layers in the structure formed in Barth et. al. as taught above based upon the teachings of Oda that it is desirable to do so. Further, this would

Art Unit: 1763

simply provide a means for desirably enhancing the bond formed between adjacent layers of material in the structure formed in Barth et. al.

18. Claim 37 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

19. Applicant's arguments filed 10-02' have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the following points regarding the examiner's rejection of their claimed subject matter:

-Applicant argues that the examiner has fail to prove that it is well known or is conventional in the prior art to selectively etch back or recess a W layer to underlying TiN/Ti layers on an ILD layer on the surface of a wafer.

The examiner must disagree.

-The examiner has applied art (i.e.-Oda) which prove that it is well known or is conventional in the prior art to selectively etch back or recess a W layer to underlying TiN/Ti layers on an ILD layer on the surface of a wafer.

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1763

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner George A. Goudreau whose telephone number is (703) -308-1915. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Examiner Gregory Mills, can be reached on (703) -308-1633. The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) -306-3186.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) -308-0661.


George A. Goudreau/gag

Primary Examiner

AU 1763